

MEETING SUMMARY
FOREST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FMAC) MEETING
Michigan United Conservation Clubs of Michigan
2101 Wood Street, Lansing
February 20, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

FMAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms. Lynne M. Boyd, Chair, Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Mr. Thomas Dunn, American Motorcycle Association, District 14
Mr. Warren Suchovsky, Suchovsky Logging
Mr. Bill Botti, Michigan Forest Association
Dr. Margaret (Peg) Gale, Michigan Tech
Ms. Erin McDonough, Michigan United Conservation Clubs (MUCC)
Mr. Thomas Barnes, Michigan Association of Timbermen
Ms. Rachel Kuntzsch, Heart of the Lakes
Mr. Marvin Roberson, Sierra Club
Mr. George Berghorn, Michigan Forest Products Council
Dr. Daniel Keathley, Michigan State University
Mr. Frank Ruswick, Department of Environmental Quality

FMAC ADVISORS PRESENT

Mr. Jerry Bird, USDA Forest Service, Huron-Manistee National Forest
Mr. Thomas Ward, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), NRCS

FMAC MEMBERS ABSENT

Mr. William Manson, Jr., Michigan Snowmobile Association
Mr. Desmond Jones, Michigan Tree Farm System
Mr. Joel Blohm, Great Northern Lumber of Michigan
Ms. Susan Holben, MEDC
Mr. Gordon Wenk, Department of Agriculture

PUBLIC ATTENDEES/GUESTS

Mr. Stephen Shine, Department of Agriculture
Ms. Amy Spray, MUCC
Mr. Brad Garmon, Michigan Environmental Council
Mr. Joshua Rawson, Michigan State University
Mr. J.R. Richardson, Commissioner, Natural Resources Commission

DNR STAFF PRESENT

Dr. Donna LaCourt
Ms. Kerry Gray
Mr. Larry Pedersen
Mr. David Price
Ms. Kim Korbecki

WELCOME

Chair Boyd called the meeting of the Forest Management Advisory Committee to order at 1:10 p.m. She commented that a few members of the Committee were going to be arriving late, and would like to wait on the scheduled action items until they had all arrived. **Chair Boyd** reported

that **Mr. Bill Cook** and **Mr. Bill Bobier** resigned from the Committee. Chair Boyd introduced new committee members **Mr. Bill Botti** with the Michigan Forest Association, **Mr. Tom Barnes** with Michigan Association of Timbermen, **Mr. Marvin Roberson** with the Sierra Club and **Mr. Tom Ward** with the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service serving as an FMAC advisor. There are currently two vacancies on the Committee that need to be replaced, a private forestry consultant to fill the position that **Mr. Mark Janke** vacated and the MSU Extension position on the FMAC that **Mr. Cook** represented. She stated she had exhausted her resources and asked the Committee to send her possible suggestions to fill these vacancies; if it was not possible to fill from the Extension she will check with Director Rebecca Humphries (Director), DNR, for other ideas.

Chair Boyd opened the subject of the Bylaws and asked for discussion while waiting for a quorum.

Mr. Botti directed the Committee to Article III, Section 1, Composition, and questioned why there was not a number of required members provided. **Chair Boyd** responded the decision was made by Director Humphries. **Mr. Roberson** suggested not having an actual number would be more beneficial in regards to the quorum requirements. Discussion ensued. The Committee decided to leave this Section as is.

Mr. Barnes broached the subject of electronic voting. **Chair Boyd** responded the issue with that is the public being able to hear the discussion, which isn't possible with electronic voting.

Mr. Suchovsky questioned the definition of how many votes are needed for action items. Discussion ensued. **Chair Boyd** stated it was written to reflect a simple majority vote, one over one-half. She commented there is the opportunity to change the language before voting on the Bylaws.

Ms. Kuntzsch asked if there shouldn't be someone on the Committee representing renewable resource; **Chair Boyd** responded that **Mr. Barnes** has that area covered. **Mr. Roberson** suggested having someone from the Governor's Office on the Committee.

After discussion, the decision was made to change the language of the Bylaws, Article V, Section 3, Quorum, from "serving" to "voting".

Mr. Botti stated that Article VI, Removal of Committee Members, Section 2, Non-Attendance of Meetings, the word "shall" was rather strong. **Mr. Roberson** commented the word "shall" was used intentionally.

Chair Boyd stated if there were no more comments on the Bylaws, the Committee would wait to vote when a quorum had arrived. She suggested moving on to the State Forest Management Plan.

MICHIGAN STATE FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN (SFMP)

Chair Boyd opened by stating there are four elements to the SFMP. In 2001 a commitment was made to adopt Ecosystem Management, Ecoregional Plans are now being drafted, three are scheduled to be completed by the end of this calendar year with the fourth being scheduled to be completed during the next calendar year. The DNR originally started with the Ecoregional Plans but were having difficulties so they moved to the SFMP. The DNR moved forward with Forest Certification, and was required to have the SFMP done by February 29, 2008, a deadline

set by the Forest Certification auditors. The SFMP was presented at the February NRC meeting for information, and will be presented for action at the March NRC meeting. The SFMP is currently is going through the public comment period, and has been presented at stakeholder meetings, as well as being presented to the FMAC. As a result, many revisions have been made. **Chair Boyd** stated it was being presented to FMAC at this meeting for comment.

Mr. Roberson stated the public comment period is too short. **Chair Boyd** responded that the Committee members should encourage the public to keep sending in comments and if the DNR cannot deal with all the comments, a recommendation can be made to the Director to extend the comment period. **Mr. Price** reported the end of February timeline was to accommodate the Forest Certification auditors. **Chair Boyd** stated getting the SFMP in front of the NRC was important as it gave a greater opportunity for the public to get their comments heard. She also commented that although the SFMP is going before the NRC in March for action, it is the Director's decision whether to take action or to extend it for another month.

Mr. Suchovsky commented it is a working document so technically comments will be accepted as the process proceeds. **Mr. Pedersen** reported the redesign of the Ecoregional Plan caused some delay, but at this point the document is fairly close to being completed. **Mr. Price** stated the SFMP must be revisited every five-to-ten years. **Mr. Barnes** stated that from the public perception, the SFMP is being forced on them; he questioned how serious the public comments will be taken in such a short period of time and referred to the length of the document. **Mr. Price** responded he will continue to take public comments and do his best to move forward up until the March NRC meeting. **Mr. Roberson** suggested posting on the website that the DNR will continue to take comments after the deadline, and requested that the Director extend the public comment period by a month. **Mr. Botti** questioned if the auditors were holding to the deadline; **Chair Boyd** responded they were as they had reviewed a 2006 draft and felt the DNR needed to complete it. **Commissioner Richardson** questioned how many comments had been received to-date; **Mr. Price** responded there have been only approximately 15. **Dr. Gale** questioned if there will be a summary of comments and changes made to the SFMP by chapter posted on the DNR website; she stated it would help the Committee to have some sense of the changes that have been made. **Mr. Roberson** stated he doesn't feel the comments received are being given specific enough responses, and the responses should also be posted on the DNR website.

Chair Boyd questioned what the most difficult section had been; **Mr. Price** responded the level of detail for the SFMP compared to the Regional Plan was difficult, as they didn't want duplicate information. He stated another factor is that many areas of the state forests are not readily quantifiable. **Commission Richardson** asked if the DNR is able to assess how they are doing moving towards the goal and if there is anything to measure progress on an annual basis; **Mr. Price** responded the Forest Certification annual audit assists with that.

Mr. Suchovsky questioned if the SFMP is too long; looking at it as a private landowner there seems to be too many things to weigh against. **Mr. Pedersen** responded the length of the document is because people requested more on their specific subject areas and the DNR had to figure out where to draw the line without leaving anyone's needs out. **Mr. Price** stated the DNR staff has tried to look at it from both perspectives, i.e. more detail, yet keep it as condensed as possible.

Mr. Roberson commented the DNR will most likely hear what the public doesn't like about the SFMP, but congratulated the DNR for getting the SFMP out on the timeline they had. He went

on to say that there had been too much specificity, and it wasn't appropriate to have a statewide rotation age; the DNR did a good job balancing out those issues.

Mr. Barnes stated one area that is not prominent in the SFMP is biomass, how to utilize and how much is retained. He pointed out there has been a push by Governor Granholm for Michigan to be a leader in this area and feels the SFMP needs to have more about woody biomass and the management of it. **Dr. LaCourt** responded the DNR has other efforts currently taking place that address this subject. She reported there is a project being funded by the Michigan Forest Finance Authority to develop woody biomass harvesting guidelines. These guidelines will be applicable to both state and private forest lands, and are expected to be completed within the next 12 months. **Dr. Gale** commented we are limited by the lack of GIS and is glad to hear the DNR is developing and implementing IFMAP. She also stressed the importance of future desired conditions.

Chair Boyd asked the Committee for other comments. **Mr. Ward** broached the subject of eastern white tail deer and their impact on forest regeneration. **Mr. Pedersen** responded there has been an expansion of cedar in Michigan. **Mr. Ward** commented he has heard there is not much tree planting because of deer eating it in most counties. **Mr. Price** stated white tail deer is one of the problems, but people are saying it hasn't been proven yet. **Mr. Ward** feels this threatens Forest Certification for some companies located in the Upper Peninsula. He would like to see a team formed to come up with a solution for the problem.

Mr. Ward reported there was a conference last month at MSU regarding native habitats in Michigan, which presented two issues; fire regime and white tail deer. **Mr. Price** stated the DNR will be doing regional surveys much more frequently to look at the success of regeneration, and problems identified will be dealt with quickly. **Mr. Pedersen** commented the DNR is treating this more frequently as a forest health problem.

Mr. Berghorn spoke to reasons for doing certain things related back to certification and the contents of the SFI and FSC standards, often specific standards that talk about inclusion of numeric based management objectives. **Chair Boyd** responded the plan was presented to the certification auditors, and they had no objections with the way it was set up. **Dr. Gale** asked if the DNR includes future desired conditions for all stands; **Mr. Pedersen** responded not at this time, but Michigan has the most involved tracking system. **Mr. Berghorn** commented on sustainable issues such as higher degrees of mortality. Harvest is dropping mortality levels and he questioned if the DNR knows what land bases are capable of producing. He stated the bigger issue gets back to the plans and multi-layered plans; where is unifying goals or objectives that drives consistent approach? He questioned if this is the operational level plan, and we are seeing inconsistencies in the plan, where will consistency come from? **Mr. Price** responded rather than try to approach this at a higher level, the DNR chooses to evaluate stands, do an analysis and decide what to do with stands that will be sustainable. The process is building from the bottom up. **Mr. Berghorn** stated a key component of that plan working is consistency across the board; a consistent approach on stand levels is lacking, and he is asking for consistency in the plan. Discussion ensued.

Chair Boyd asked to return to the SFMP discussion after taking a break to vote on the action items while a quorum was present.

COMMITTEE BYLAWS

Mr. Barnes directed the Committee to Article V – Meetings, Section 6, second paragraph; motion to change “approved” to “adopted”. Also, Article VI – Removal of Committee Members, Section 2, change “does not attend” to “misses”. **Mr. Suchovsky** brought up attendance, and if attendance via conference call will count as attending the meeting; **Chair Boyd** responded that although she had not taken this to the Attorney General's Office for an opinion, precedent has already been set by the Natural Resource Trust Fund Board. Discussion ensued.

Motion: **Mr. Suchovsky** moved to adopt the FMAC Bylaws, as amended; seconded by Mr. Dunn.

Motion passed unanimously; Bylaws of the FMAC adopted.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOTION: **Mr. Roberson** moved to adopt the Agenda of the February 20, 2008 FMAC meeting; seconded by **Mr. Suchovsky**.

Motion passed unanimously; Agenda adopted

ADOPTION OF MEETING SUMMARIES (December 5, November 7, September 12 and August 1, 2007)

Motion: **Ms. Kuntzsch** moved to adopt the December 5, November 7, September 12 and August 1, 2007 Meeting Summaries of the FMAC; seconded by **Mr. Suchovsky**.

Motion passed unanimously; Meeting Summaries adopted.

ADOPTION OF 2008 MEETING SCHEDULE

Discussion ensued. **Mr. Barnes** stated he prefers the FMAC meeting be back-to-back with the NRC meetings; **Chair Boyd** responded the Committee had already discussed scheduling a meeting around when the NRC out-of-town meeting was going to occur. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Roberson commented a schedule had already been created, and if the meetings couldn't be fit around the NRC meetings, to keep the schedule as is. **Mr. Barnes** retracted his request.

Motion: **Mr. Roberson** moved to adopt the 2008 FMAC meeting schedule, as is; seconded by **Mr. Suchovsky**.

Motion passed unanimously; 2008 FMAC meeting schedule adopted.

MICHIGAN STATE FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN (continued)

Mr. Suchovsky commented the State is looking from a policy standpoint to encourage investment; in his industry they need to know what types of products are available. He stated the SFMP needs to focus more on what is available for investors.

Dr. LaCourt responded she doesn't believe the SFMP is written to preclude the development of metrics in the future. The DNR now has tools to evaluate these needs, but until IFMAP is squarely in place she is concerned about the DNR's ability to formulate and implement meaningful metrics. Although the DNR is moving in that direction, it has not yet been completely accomplished. **Commissioner Richardson** stated that in the SFMP a lot of people have different areas they have at stake, i.e. their own interests. People want a degree of certainty they will be able to get raw materials. **Chair Boyd** responded there are many interest groups that want their product balanced, not just on the ground sustainability, but competition with all the different programs. **Mr. Barnes** commented the key is to have some idea of what is currently available. **Dr. LaCourt** responded the DNR can provide estimates based on past performance.

Motion: **Mr. Roberson** moved to send a resolution to the Director to extend public comment for at least a month; seconded by **Dr. Gale**

Discussion ensued. **Mr. Roberson** suggested changing “extending public comment period for at least one month” to “it is the sense of this Committee there has not been enough time for public comment, and request an extension of the public comment period by at least one month”. Original motion was withdrawn.

Motion: **Mr. Roberson** moved to adopt the resolution to Director Humphries; seconded by **Dr. Gale**.
Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

CURRENT WOODY BIOMASS PROJECT IN MICHIGAN

Dr. Gale provided the Committee with a handout that **Mr. Bill Cook** had created which reports a summary of what is currently happening in Michigan. **Dr. Keathley** stated **Dr. Gale** served on a planning committee at a bioenergy summit. The plan is to poll stakeholders, and eventually report on what Michigan Tech and MSU should be doing. Discussion ensued.

Dr. LaCourt reported the Agriculture, Forestry and Waste Technical Working Group have held two meetings, and are developing a catalog of actions; they will provide an interim report in April. **Chair Boyd** requested **Dr. Gale** send the handout she provided to **Ms. Korbecki**, who will then send it to all Committee members. Any changes the Committee would like to see should be sent to **Dr. Gale**. **Chair Boyd** asked the Committee if they would like further discussion; there was none.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS- Collection of Ideas

Chair Boyd opened discussion. **Mr. Roberson** stated he felt the DNR website was too difficult to navigate to find where and when the compartment reviews were scheduled for. **Mr. Berghorn** suggested having **Dr. Dennis Propst** attend an FMAC meeting to give a presentation on internet for resource management issues. Discussion ensued regarding methods to reach landowners.

Mr. Roberson suggested sending notices out to adjacent landowners where compartment reviews were going to be taking place. **Chair Boyd** responded the DNR doesn't have the resources to do that at this time, but previously the Committee had discussed the possibility of putting information in tax notices or newsletters. **Mr. Shine** stated the local assessment departments could be helpful but they won't give lists of names, staff would have to be sent in. **Mr. Suchovsky** expressed it is more important for the public that the SFMP and State Management Plans be developed. **Mr. Roberson** agreed, but stated the public are complaining about lack of notice of compartment reviews, not management plans. **Ms. Spray** questioned the timeline required for compartment review notification; it is currently one month (30 days), but notification is normally advertised months in advance. **Mr. Suchovsky** mentioned Ms. Maureen McDonough might be a good person to speak to FMAC about public perception.

Ms. Kuntzsch stated the DNR calendar is often empty. **Mr. Barnes** suggested getting user-lists together for informational purposes. **Chair Boyd** suggested ten-year cycles for user-lists,

or groups. **Mr. Roberson** mentioned realtors, and creating a way for people to comment during field visits, rather than waiting for an open house. **Chair Boyd** stated these were great ideas, and the DNR could look at changing the current procedures. **Dr. Gale** mentioned the desire for future conditions to be a part of the compartment review prescriptions.

Mr. Roberson suggested a ten minute agenda item at every FMAC meeting to discuss “process improvement” ideas.

Mr. Suchovsky stated he is concerned with public participation and how the DNR has responded. His impression is that the public doesn’t think the DNR listens to them. **Chair Boyd** responded the DNR cannot always respond to every comment, but often replies to those they can. **Mr. Roberson** suggested a “generic” response so the public knows the DNR has received and is acknowledging their comments.

Mr. Shine commented the staff did an excellent job of explaining procedures on the field trips the FMAC took with the public. **Chair Boyd** asked **Mr. Pedersen** to distribute a handout of what has been happening in Roscommon, something **Dr. Gale** had requested at a previous FMAC meeting. **Mr. Barnes** stated he felt this handout would be beneficial for the people in the Roscommon area. **Mr. Roberson** commented he would like to see the total number of acres harvested per year as citizens of Roscommon are claiming the acres being harvested keep rising. **Ms. Kuntzsch** questioned if it would be beneficial to send the analyses to the legislature to distribute to their constituents; proactively share information with the legislature to improve the connection with the DNR. Discussion ensued.

NEXT MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

Election of Officers
Public Participation Process
DRAFT ORV Management Plan
Maureen McDonough, Public Perception Presentation
Certification Audit Results Update
Monthly Budget Update

NEXT MEETING

April 16, 2008
MUCC (tentative)
2101 Wood Street, Lansing

Motion: **Mr. Roberson** moved to adjourn the FMAC meeting; seconded by **Mr. Dunn**.
Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.